

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,

Plaintiff,
v.

John Taylor
Defendant.

Case No. CR 17-216-EMC-1

STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT

FILED

MAY 24 2017

For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on May 24, 2017, the Court ^{SUSAN Y. SOONG} ~~excludes time~~ under the Speedy Trial Act from May 24, 2017 to June 7, 2017 ^{CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT} and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):

____ Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).

____ The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [*check applicable reasons*] ____ the number of defendants, ____ the nature of the prosecution, or ____ the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).

____ Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

____ Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

✓ ____ Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 5/24/2017

JOSEPH C. SPERO
Chief Magistrate Judge

STIPULATED: _____

Attorney for Defendant

Assistant United States Attorney